

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/763,733	02/27/2001	Petra Loos	02481.1726	9899
22852	7590 .07/29/2002			
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT &			EXAMINER	
DUNNER LLI 1300 I STREE	•	SIEFKE, SAMUEL P		
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20005		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1743	
			DATE MAILED: 07/29/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1+ >-				
	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/763,733	LOOS, PETRA					
ĵ.	Examiner	Art Unit					
. ``	Samuel P Siefke	1743					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 08 July 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP				
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (	of extension and the corresponding am- the shortened statutory period for reply ice later than three months after the ma CFR 1.704(b).	ount of the fee. The app originally set in the final illing date of the final reje	ropriate extension Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
<ul><li>(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li></ul>							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I							
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
<ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li></ul> NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NO	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:	•						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10. Other:							

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The prior art still is structually capable of performing the function of a handle. Note Fig. 2 of the current application states that the handle can be a rod, the prior is a form a rod.

JEFFREY SNAY
PRIMARY FXAMINER